| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|----------------------|--------------|
| | 10/608,310 | KUMAR ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Tri H. Phan | 2616 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Pending</u> | | |
| (1) <u>Tri H. Phan</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Chui-kiu Teresa Wong (Reg# 48,042). | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 16 January 2008 | Time: <u>2:13 PM</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: Problems with condition term "operable to" in claims 19, 30 and 37 in broadest interpretation. | | |
| Claims discussed: Claims 19, 30 and 37. | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: None. | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Discussed on problem with condition term "operable to" in claims 19, 30 and 37. Agreement was reached and Supplemental Amendment will be filed. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | · . |
| 7. Am | | |
| (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |